UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,005	12/14/2005	Hiroshi Kimura	FEC 143NP	7011
23995 7590 04/03/2008 RABIN & Berdo, PC			EXAMINER	
1101 14TH STI		PERRY, ANTHONY T		
SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2879	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/520,005	KIMURA, HIROSHI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ANTHONY T. PERRY	2879			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 December</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice of the pract	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 11-29 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 11-17,19,22-25 and 27 is/are rejected 7) Claim(s) 18,20,21,26,28 and 29 is/are objected 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	vn from consideration. to. election requirement. re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected or by □ objected or by	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/30/04,8/25/04,5/03/06,11/06/06,11/09/	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 07. 6) Other:	ite			



Application No.

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-17, 19, 22-25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Beierlein et al. (US 6,501,217).

Regarding claim 11, Beierlein discloses an organic electroluminescent device comprising an organic electroluminescent light-emitting part including an organic light-emitting layer (29,30), between a metal electrode (26) and a transparent electrode (31), the organic electroluminescent device comprising: a transparent electrically conductive film (28) on a surface of the metal electrode (26), on the organic electroluminescent light-emitting part (29,30) side thereof (for example, see Fig. 5). Beierlein teaches the thickness of the transparent electrically conductive film (28) being 0.001-1 microns and the barrier film (27) 0.01-1 microns (distance between the metal layer (26) and the light emitting layer being 0.011-2 microns) (for example, see table 2), which inherently satisfies the claimed equation: $L=(2n+1)\lambda/4$ (n=0, 1, 2, . . .), where L is the optical distance from the organic light-emitting layer to the metal electrode, and λ is the wavelength of light emitted by the organic light-emitting layer.

Regarding claim 12, Beierlein teaches the transparent electrically conductive film (28) being formed of ZnO (for example, see col. 7, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 13, Beierlein discloses a monochrome panel or area color panel, including the organic electroluminescent device according to claim 11 (for example, see Fig. 5).

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 14, Beierlein discloses an organic electroluminescent device comprising an organic electroluminescent light-emitting part including an organic light-emitting layer (29,30), between a metal electrode (26) and a transparent electrode (31), the organic electroluminescent device comprising: a transparent electrically conductive film (28) is provided on a surface of the metal electrode, on the organic electroluminescent light-emitting part side thereof; wherein light of wavelengths different than the wavelength of light emitted by the organic light-emitting layer is absorbed by at least one, or both, of the metal electrode and the transparent electrically conductive film, and only light of the wavelength emitted by the organic electroluminescent light-emitting layer is discharged from the transparent electrode (for example, see Fig. 5 and col. 12, lines 9-10).

Regarding claim 15, Beierlein teaches the transparent electrically conductive film (28) being formed of ZnO (for example, see col. 7, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 16, Beierlein discloses a monochrome panel or area color panel, including the organic electroluminescent device according to claim 14 (for example, see Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 17, Beierlein discloses an organic EL device that comprises an EL layer (for example, Alq3, which emits blue light) and a metal electrode (Mo or an alloy thereof), which will inherently absorb blue light (for example, see col. 4, lines 7-10).

Regarding claim 19, Beierlein teaches the transparent electrically conductive film being ITO, which is indium oxide doped with tin as an impurity. It is noted that ITO has a blue tint to it. Therefor, Beierlein teaches the transparent electrically conductive film has an impurity added thereto so that it is has a same color of the light emitted by the organic electroluminescent light-emitting layer (Alq3 emits blue light) (for example, see col. 7, lines 43-45).

Regarding claim 22, Beierlein discloses an organic electroluminescent device comprising an organic electroluminescent light-emitting part including an organic light-emitting layer (29,30), between a metal electrode (26) and a transparent electrode (31), the organic electroluminescent device comprising: a transparent electrically conductive film (28) on a surface of the metal electrode (26), on the organic electroluminescent light-emitting part (29,30) side thereof (for example, see Fig. 5). Beierlein teaches the thickness of the transparent electrically conductive film (28) being 0.001-1 microns and the barrier film (27) 0.01-1 microns (distance between the metal layer (26) and the light emitting layer being 0.011-2 microns) (for example, see table 2), which inherently satisfies the claimed equation: $L=(2n+1)\lambda/4$ (n=0, 1, 2,), where L is the optical distance from the organic light-emitting layer to the metal electrode, and λ is the wavelength of light emitted by the organic light-emitting layer. and wherein light of wavelengths different than the wavelength of light emitted by the organic electroluminescent light-emitting layer is absorbed by the metal electrode and/or the transparent electrically conductive film, and only light of the wavelength emitted by the organic electroluminescent light-emitting layer is discharged from the transparent electrode (for example, see Fig. 5 and col. 12, lines 9-10).

Regarding claim 23, Beierlein teaches the transparent electrically conductive film (28) being formed of ZnO (for example, see col. 7, lines 43-46).

Regarding claim 24, Beierlein discloses a monochrome panel or area color panel, including the organic electroluminescent device according to claim 22 (for example, see Fig. 5).

Regarding claim 25, Beierlein discloses an organic EL device that comprises an EL layer (for example, Alq3, which emits blue light) and a metal electrode (Mo or an alloy thereof), which will inherently absorb blue light (for example, see col. 4, lines 7-10).

Art Unit: 2879

Regarding claim 27, Beierlein teaches the transparent electrically conductive film being ITO, which is indium oxide doped with tin as an impurity. It is noted that ITO has a blue tint to it. Therefor, Beierlein teaches the transparent electrically conductive film has an impurity added thereto so that it is has a same color of the light emitted by the organic electroluminescent light-emitting layer (Alq3 emits blue light) (for example, see col. 7, lines 43-45).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18, 20-21, 26, and 28-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record fails to disclose or fairly suggest:

- * A blue monochrome backlight and color-converting filters, wherein the metal electrode absorbs light other than blue light, and only the blue monochrome light from the backlight is reflected by the metal electrode, in combination with the remaining claimed limitations as called for in claim 18. The examiner notes that using a blue monochrome backlight in conjunction with color converting layers is well known the art of full color EL display devices, however, there is no suggestion in the prior art of record of a metal electrode provided in such a device, wherein the metal electrode absorbs light other than blue light, and only reflects the blue monochrome light from the backlight.
- * An organic electroluminescent device wherein the transparent electrically conductive film on a surface of the metal electrode is constituted from a material of one of In₂O₃-ZnO, In₂O₃-SnO₂, ZnO, and SnO₂, containing an impurity of one

Art Unit: 2879

of CuO, Co, and Ti at a concentration of not more than 1%, and the transparent electrically conductive film absorbs blue light, in combination with the remaining claimed limitations as called for in claim 20 (claim 21 would be allowable for the same reasons since it is dependent on claim 20).

- * A blue monochrome backlight and color-converting filters, wherein the metal electrode absorbs light other than blue light, and only the blue monochrome light from the backlight is reflected by the metal electrode, in combination with the remaining claimed limitations as called for in claim 26. The examiner notes that using a blue monochrome backlight in conjunction with color converting layers is well known the art of full color EL display devices, however, there is no suggestion in the prior art of record of a metal electrode provided in such a device, wherein the metal electrode absorbs light other than blue light, and only reflects the blue monochrome light from the backlight.
- * An organic electroluminescent device wherein the transparent electrically conductive film on a surface of the metal electrode is constituted from a material of one of In₂O₃-ZnO, In₂O₃-SnO₂, ZnO, and SnO₂, containing an impurity of one of CuO, Co, and Ti at a concentration of not more than 1%, and the transparent electrically conductive film absorbs blue light, in combination with the remaining claimed limitations as called for in claim 28 (claim 29 would be allowable for the same reasons since it is dependent on claim 28).

Art Unit: 2879

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Anthony Perry whose telephone number is (571) 272-2459. The

examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 9:00AM to 5:30PM Monday thru

Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for this

Group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Anthony Perry/

Anthony Perry

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2879

March 30, 2008

/Mariceli Santiago/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2879